



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/639,508	08/16/2000	Richard S. Chomik	460.1891USV	3194

7590

11/26/2003

Charles N.J. Ruggiero Esq
OHLANDT GREELEY RUGGIERO & PERLE LLP
One Landmark Square
Stamford, CT 06901-2682

EXAMINER

DEXTER, CLARK F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3724

DATE MAILED: 11/26/2003

22

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/639,508

Applicant(s)

Chomik et al.

Examiner

Clark F. Dexter

Art Unit

3724



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mr. Andrew Gust(3) Mr. Clark Dexter(2) Mr. Charles Ruggiero

(4) _____

Date of Interview Nov 25, 2003Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☐ Personal (copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Claim(s) discussed: None

Identification of prior art discussed:

Greenwood et al., pn 5,499,729Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant's position is that Greenwood does not disclose or teach a method of forming a plurality of perforations in which all of the perforations have a centerline, wherein each centerline is coincident with a radius that forms a concave curvature of the domed portion. Applicant argued that while some perforations of Greenwood may or may not be perforated along the claimed radius of the domed portion, there is no teaching that all of the perforations are aligned as such. Applicant also argued that the statements made in the affidavits support this argument. Mr. Dexter stated that applicant's position would be further considered upon receipt of applicant's response.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

CLARK F. DEXTER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3724

Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.